

# GLASS TARIFF SAFE.

A Vigorous Attack Upon the  
Increased Duty Made by  
an Iowa Republican.

## M'KINLEY SAVES HIS BILL.

But Wins by the Exceedingly Narrow  
Margin of Four Votes.

## TIN PLATE IS STILL IN DANGER.

Pittsburg Industries Occupying the Attention  
of the House.

## THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE MEETING.

Henderson, Republican Congressman  
from Iowa, opposed the increased tariff on  
glass. By a vote of 107 to 103 McKinley  
carried it through, however. Buttermore  
will probably move to-day to strike out the  
duty in tin plate. The canned goods men  
are hard at work to accomplish this purpose.  
The Ways and Means Committee re-  
mains firm upon the question.

### OFFICIAL TELEGRAM TO THE DISPATCH.

WASHINGTON, May 16.—The delegation  
from the tin plate importers and the Na-  
tional Canned Goods Association still re-  
mains here, despite the absolute refusal of  
the Ways and Means Committee to give  
any hope of a reduction of the duty on  
tin plate. The delegates are still interview-  
ing individual members and they claim that,  
notwithstanding the opposition of the  
Ways and Means Committee, they have  
still hope of putting tin on the free list, or  
at least of securing a reduction to the present  
rate.

It is said that Mr. Buttermore will offer  
an amendment placing tin plate on the free  
list. If he does not, Rank, of Mary-  
land, will do so. But the interested parties  
naturally would prefer that the  
amendment should come from a Republi-  
can. Mr. Mudd, a Maryland Republican,  
states that he will vote for the amendment,  
but it is doubtful if there are enough others  
who will defy the Ways and Means Com-  
mittee.

### A PROFITABLE CONCERN.

In his speech the other day, Congressman  
Buttermore asserted that one corporation  
had during its existence of 19 years, divided  
a profit of \$61,000,000 on its original invest-  
ment of \$1,250,000. This statement led  
to a great deal of comment, and it was  
emphatically denied by a number. Mr. But-  
termore said to-day that his statement was  
true, and that the Calumet and Hecla Cop-  
per Mining Company was the corporation to  
which he referred.

Just after the tariff bill was taken up in  
the House to-day, Mr. McKinley offered an  
amendment specifically including glass  
chimneys in the clause relative to this  
blown glass at a duty of 10c a dozen, and 40  
per cent ad valorem. In response to a ques-  
tion by Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, Mr. Mc-  
Kinley stated that the present duty on  
lamp chimneys was 45 per cent, and the  
proposed duty between 50 and 60 per cent.

Mr. Henderson inquired how many lamp  
chimneys were imported.

Mr. McKinley replied that he had no  
exact data.

### AN IOWA REPUBLICAN'S QUERY.

Mr. Henderson inquired how, if he  
knew that the duty should be increased, [Ap-  
plause and laughter on Democratic side.]

Mr. McKinley replied that the committee  
knew that it was impossible for our own  
people to manufacture these chimneys under  
the present rate of duty and continue to pay  
the present rate of wages.

Mr. Henderson inquired whether the  
gentlemen knew what proportion of the  
chimneys was imported and what manu-  
factured in this country. Mr. McKinley  
replied that he did not, but he knew that  
the bill did not give a cent of duty more  
than was necessary to compensate for the  
difference in the labor cost here and abroad.

Mr. Henderson—For myself I am not  
going to vote for the increase of any duty  
when I have not the information to justify  
that vote. [Democratic applause.]

### ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY.

Mr. McKinley said that the committee  
had no personal pride in the bill or any  
part of it. The committee had done its best  
with the information at its command. Every  
member of the majority who had been de-  
clared agreed that the proposed duty on lamp  
chimneys was absolutely necessary to pre-  
serve that industry in this country.

Mr. Henderson did not want any Demo-  
crats on the floor to howl over what he was  
saying [laughter]. He could not control  
Democratic lungs. If he could he would  
cut off some of the supply [laughter]. But  
he did not intend to vote for an increase  
of duty on lamp chimneys unless he knew  
why he did. No one knew better than he  
the difficulty that any committee, Demo-  
cratic or Republican, had in making a  
tariff bill, and he did not want to be  
a blockade to a proper adjustment, but the  
point he wanted to make was this—that he  
would not vote for any increase of duty  
unless he was informed that there was a good  
reason for it. If the manufacturers of  
chimneys in this country were prosperous  
the duty should be left as it was; if they  
were being driven off the manufacturing  
field he was willing to protect them. The  
committee had no data on the subject.

### POLITICAL MILLENNIUM COMING.

Mr. Candler, of Massachusetts, said that  
it was his duty as a Representative, when-  
ever his constituents objected to a provision  
in the bill, to agitate against it, and have it  
changed if possible. He was not only a Re-  
publican, but a protectionist, and he looked  
forward to the time when the people of the  
United States would once more declare in  
favor of the protective principle, and the  
members on the other side would free them-  
selves from the free trade influence. It  
could not be expected that any committee  
could perfect a bill that would meet the  
wants of every part of the United States.  
The bill could be perfected only by taking  
it up by sections. When the principle of

# TRANSIENT ADVERTISEMENTS RECEIVED

protection was firmly established then a  
tariff bill could be taken out of politics, and  
discussed and amended by sections without  
denunciation, and in a fair spirit.

Mr. Springer, of Illinois, read from a  
Pittsburg newspaper a statement that Rep-  
resentative Buttermore's speech had created  
contestation among the protectionists, and  
that the Tin Plate Association had urged  
its members to hasten to Washington.

### LAMPS GET THE BENEFIT.

Mr. Ralnes, of New York, told of the  
growth of the glass industry in his district,  
and maintained that the workmen received  
the benefit of the tariff in increased wages.  
Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, offered as a sub-  
stitute for the pending amendment a pro-  
vision that lamp chimneys should continue  
to pay the present duty of 45 per cent. He  
did not want to break down the domestic in-  
dustry, but he would not vote for an increase  
of the duty.

After further debate Mr. Henderson's  
amendment (retaining the present duty on  
lamp chimneys) was defeated—103 to 107.  
The following Republicans voted with Hen-  
derson: Adams, of Illinois; Buttermore,  
of Ohio; Dooliver, of Iowa; Swener, of  
Iowa; Lacey, of Iowa; Kerr, of Iowa; Laws,  
of Nebraska; Hopkins, of Illinois; Morrill,  
of Kansas; Candler, of Massachusetts; Hill,  
of Illinois; Dunsell, of Minnesota; Lind, of  
Minnesota, and Reed, of Iowa.

### MR. ANDREW, OF MASSACHUSETTS, CRITICIZED THE HIGH RATES OF DUTY ON GLASS.

Mr. McKinley said that there were  
things in the bill which he did not ap-  
prove. There were amendments he would  
like to make if he alone were to be con-  
sidered, but the committee had to look to  
every interest in the United States. No  
single man could have in any tariff bill ex-  
actly what he wanted, and so gentlemen  
wanted a duty raised or lowered, but they  
forgot that in the preparation of a bill cov-  
ering more than 3,000 articles, the committee  
had to go into a compromise, not of a  
single interest, but of all the varied and  
combined interests of the United States. [Ap-  
plause.]

Gentlemen on the other side said that  
the duties in the bill were too high. In the  
glass schedule of the Mills bill the per-  
centage ranged from 60 to 152 per cent. If  
that was a tariff, why should not the  
Republicans increase the tariff and make it  
protective in favor of the labor of the  
United States? Why had the gentlemen  
on the other side a duty of 152 per cent  
on plate glass? Was it because it was a  
revenue tariff, or was it because the Demo-  
cratic party of Missouri made that a con-  
dition of its support of the Mills bill? [Ap-  
plause.]

### MR. SPRINGER QUOTED FROM THE TESTIMONY OF THE GLASS MANUFACTURERS OF PITTSBURG.

Mr. Springer quoted from the testimony  
of the glass manufacturers of Pittsburg to  
the effect that if he had free raw material  
he could pay higher wages. Mr. Mills was  
glad to hear his friend (Mr. McKinley) re-  
vise his speech of two years ago, in which  
he characterized the then pending bill as a  
free trade measure. The high duties on the  
glassware schedule of that bill did not meet  
his (Mr. Mills) views. He had been forced  
to accept them. His friend was placed in  
the same predicament in regard to his bill.  
(Mr. McKinley) had at first put a protection  
on hides in his bill, and yet he had been  
compelled to take a free trade position and  
put hides on the free list. Mr. McKinley's  
amendment was adopted.

Mr. Dooliver, of Iowa, made a strong  
speech, in which, in the name of the people  
of his district, he urged the passage of the  
bill. He said that the bill was a protection  
to the people of his district, and that he  
had become weary of this talk of the de-  
pressed condition of the Iowa farmers.

### A FREE TRADE VIEW.

Mr. Clark, of Alabama, suggested that  
the House should take the tariff on the State  
of Alabama on a platform denouncing high  
tariffs. He prophesied that when the bill  
went to the Senate it would be so amended  
that the free list would be called the Illinois  
list. He said that he had been told that  
the bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. MILLER'S ADDRESS HIMSELF TO THE BILL, UNCONSIDERING AN AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HENDERSON, OF IOWA.

Mr. Miller, of Ohio, said that the bill  
was a protection to the people of his district,  
and that he had become weary of this talk  
of the depressed condition of the Iowa  
farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

# TRANSIENT ADVERTISEMENTS RECEIVED

protection was firmly established then a  
tariff bill could be taken out of politics, and  
discussed and amended by sections without  
denunciation, and in a fair spirit.

Mr. Springer, of Illinois, read from a  
Pittsburg newspaper a statement that Rep-  
resentative Buttermore's speech had created  
contestation among the protectionists, and  
that the Tin Plate Association had urged  
its members to hasten to Washington.

### LAMPS GET THE BENEFIT.

Mr. Ralnes, of New York, told of the  
growth of the glass industry in his district,  
and maintained that the workmen received  
the benefit of the tariff in increased wages.  
Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, offered as a sub-  
stitute for the pending amendment a pro-  
vision that lamp chimneys should continue  
to pay the present duty of 45 per cent. He  
did not want to break down the domestic in-  
dustry, but he would not vote for an increase  
of the duty.

After further debate Mr. Henderson's  
amendment (retaining the present duty on  
lamp chimneys) was defeated—103 to 107.  
The following Republicans voted with Hen-  
derson: Adams, of Illinois; Buttermore,  
of Ohio; Dooliver, of Iowa; Swener, of  
Iowa; Lacey, of Iowa; Kerr, of Iowa; Laws,  
of Nebraska; Hopkins, of Illinois; Morrill,  
of Kansas; Candler, of Massachusetts; Hill,  
of Illinois; Dunsell, of Minnesota; Lind, of  
Minnesota, and Reed, of Iowa.

### MR. ANDREW, OF MASSACHUSETTS, CRITICIZED THE HIGH RATES OF DUTY ON GLASS.

Mr. McKinley said that there were  
things in the bill which he did not ap-  
prove. There were amendments he would  
like to make if he alone were to be con-  
sidered, but the committee had to look to  
every interest in the United States. No  
single man could have in any tariff bill ex-  
actly what he wanted, and so gentlemen  
wanted a duty raised or lowered, but they  
forgot that in the preparation of a bill cov-  
ering more than 3,000 articles, the committee  
had to go into a compromise, not of a  
single interest, but of all the varied and  
combined interests of the United States. [Ap-  
plause.]

Gentlemen on the other side said that  
the duties in the bill were too high. In the  
glass schedule of the Mills bill the per-  
centage ranged from 60 to 152 per cent. If  
that was a tariff, why should not the  
Republicans increase the tariff and make it  
protective in favor of the labor of the  
United States? Why had the gentlemen  
on the other side a duty of 152 per cent  
on plate glass? Was it because it was a  
revenue tariff, or was it because the Demo-  
cratic party of Missouri made that a con-  
dition of its support of the Mills bill? [Ap-  
plause.]

### MR. SPRINGER QUOTED FROM THE TESTIMONY OF THE GLASS MANUFACTURERS OF PITTSBURG.

Mr. Springer quoted from the testimony  
of the glass manufacturers of Pittsburg to  
the effect that if he had free raw material  
he could pay higher wages. Mr. Mills was  
glad to hear his friend (Mr. McKinley) re-  
vise his speech of two years ago, in which  
he characterized the then pending bill as a  
free trade measure. The high duties on the  
glassware schedule of that bill did not meet  
his (Mr. Mills) views. He had been forced  
to accept them. His friend was placed in  
the same predicament in regard to his bill.  
(Mr. McKinley) had at first put a protection  
on hides in his bill, and yet he had been  
compelled to take a free trade position and  
put hides on the free list. Mr. McKinley's  
amendment was adopted.

Mr. Dooliver, of Iowa, made a strong  
speech, in which, in the name of the people  
of his district, he urged the passage of the  
bill. He said that the bill was a protection  
to the people of his district, and that he  
had become weary of this talk of the de-  
pressed condition of the Iowa farmers.

### A FREE TRADE VIEW.

Mr. Clark, of Alabama, suggested that  
the House should take the tariff on the State  
of Alabama on a platform denouncing high  
tariffs. He prophesied that when the bill  
went to the Senate it would be so amended  
that the free list would be called the Illinois  
list. He said that he had been told that  
the bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. MILLER'S ADDRESS HIMSELF TO THE BILL, UNCONSIDERING AN AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HENDERSON, OF IOWA.

Mr. Miller, of Ohio, said that the bill  
was a protection to the people of his district,  
and that he had become weary of this talk  
of the depressed condition of the Iowa  
farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

# TRANSIENT ADVERTISEMENTS RECEIVED

protection was firmly established then a  
tariff bill could be taken out of politics, and  
discussed and amended by sections without  
denunciation, and in a fair spirit.

Mr. Springer, of Illinois, read from a  
Pittsburg newspaper a statement that Rep-  
resentative Buttermore's speech had created  
contestation among the protectionists, and  
that the Tin Plate Association had urged  
its members to hasten to Washington.

### LAMPS GET THE BENEFIT.

Mr. Ralnes, of New York, told of the  
growth of the glass industry in his district,  
and maintained that the workmen received  
the benefit of the tariff in increased wages.  
Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, offered as a sub-  
stitute for the pending amendment a pro-  
vision that lamp chimneys should continue  
to pay the present duty of 45 per cent. He  
did not want to break down the domestic in-  
dustry, but he would not vote for an increase  
of the duty.

After further debate Mr. Henderson's  
amendment (retaining the present duty on  
lamp chimneys) was defeated—103 to 107.  
The following Republicans voted with Hen-  
derson: Adams, of Illinois; Buttermore,  
of Ohio; Dooliver, of Iowa; Swener, of  
Iowa; Lacey, of Iowa; Kerr, of Iowa; Laws,  
of Nebraska; Hopkins, of Illinois; Morrill,  
of Kansas; Candler, of Massachusetts; Hill,  
of Illinois; Dunsell, of Minnesota; Lind, of  
Minnesota, and Reed, of Iowa.

### MR. ANDREW, OF MASSACHUSETTS, CRITICIZED THE HIGH RATES OF DUTY ON GLASS.

Mr. McKinley said that there were  
things in the bill which he did not ap-  
prove. There were amendments he would  
like to make if he alone were to be con-  
sidered, but the committee had to look to  
every interest in the United States. No  
single man could have in any tariff bill ex-  
actly what he wanted, and so gentlemen  
wanted a duty raised or lowered, but they  
forgot that in the preparation of a bill cov-  
ering more than 3,000 articles, the committee  
had to go into a compromise, not of a  
single interest, but of all the varied and  
combined interests of the United States. [Ap-  
plause.]

Gentlemen on the other side said that  
the duties in the bill were too high. In the  
glass schedule of the Mills bill the per-  
centage ranged from 60 to 152 per cent. If  
that was a tariff, why should not the  
Republicans increase the tariff and make it  
protective in favor of the labor of the  
United States? Why had the gentlemen  
on the other side a duty of 152 per cent  
on plate glass? Was it because it was a  
revenue tariff, or was it because the Demo-  
cratic party of Missouri made that a con-  
dition of its support of the Mills bill? [Ap-  
plause.]

### MR. SPRINGER QUOTED FROM THE TESTIMONY OF THE GLASS MANUFACTURERS OF PITTSBURG.

Mr. Springer quoted from the testimony  
of the glass manufacturers of Pittsburg to  
the effect that if he had free raw material  
he could pay higher wages. Mr. Mills was  
glad to hear his friend (Mr. McKinley) re-  
vise his speech of two years ago, in which  
he characterized the then pending bill as a  
free trade measure. The high duties on the  
glassware schedule of that bill did not meet  
his (Mr. Mills) views. He had been forced  
to accept them. His friend was placed in  
the same predicament in regard to his bill.  
(Mr. McKinley) had at first put a protection  
on hides in his bill, and yet he had been  
compelled to take a free trade position and  
put hides on the free list. Mr. McKinley's  
amendment was adopted.

Mr. Dooliver, of Iowa, made a strong  
speech, in which, in the name of the people  
of his district, he urged the passage of the  
bill. He said that the bill was a protection  
to the people of his district, and that he  
had become weary of this talk of the de-  
pressed condition of the Iowa farmers.

### A FREE TRADE VIEW.

Mr. Clark, of Alabama, suggested that  
the House should take the tariff on the State  
of Alabama on a platform denouncing high  
tariffs. He prophesied that when the bill  
went to the Senate it would be so amended  
that the free list would be called the Illinois  
list. He said that he had been told that  
the bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. MILLER'S ADDRESS HIMSELF TO THE BILL, UNCONSIDERING AN AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HENDERSON, OF IOWA.

Mr. Miller, of Ohio, said that the bill  
was a protection to the people of his district,  
and that he had become weary of this talk  
of the depressed condition of the Iowa  
farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

# TRANSIENT ADVERTISEMENTS RECEIVED

protection was firmly established then a  
tariff bill could be taken out of politics, and  
discussed and amended by sections without  
denunciation, and in a fair spirit.

Mr. Springer, of Illinois, read from a  
Pittsburg newspaper a statement that Rep-  
resentative Buttermore's speech had created  
contestation among the protectionists, and  
that the Tin Plate Association had urged  
its members to hasten to Washington.

### LAMPS GET THE BENEFIT.

Mr. Ralnes, of New York, told of the  
growth of the glass industry in his district,  
and maintained that the workmen received  
the benefit of the tariff in increased wages.  
Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, offered as a sub-  
stitute for the pending amendment a pro-  
vision that lamp chimneys should continue  
to pay the present duty of 45 per cent. He  
did not want to break down the domestic in-  
dustry, but he would not vote for an increase  
of the duty.

After further debate Mr. Henderson's  
amendment (retaining the present duty on  
lamp chimneys) was defeated—103 to 107.  
The following Republicans voted with Hen-  
derson: Adams, of Illinois; Buttermore,  
of Ohio; Dooliver, of Iowa; Swener, of  
Iowa; Lacey, of Iowa; Kerr, of Iowa; Laws,  
of Nebraska; Hopkins, of Illinois; Morrill,  
of Kansas; Candler, of Massachusetts; Hill,  
of Illinois; Dunsell, of Minnesota; Lind, of  
Minnesota, and Reed, of Iowa.

### MR. ANDREW, OF MASSACHUSETTS, CRITICIZED THE HIGH RATES OF DUTY ON GLASS.

Mr. McKinley said that there were  
things in the bill which he did not ap-  
prove. There were amendments he would  
like to make if he alone were to be con-  
sidered, but the committee had to look to  
every interest in the United States. No  
single man could have in any tariff bill ex-  
actly what he wanted, and so gentlemen  
wanted a duty raised or lowered, but they  
forgot that in the preparation of a bill cov-  
ering more than 3,000 articles, the committee  
had to go into a compromise, not of a  
single interest, but of all the varied and  
combined interests of the United States. [Ap-  
plause.]

Gentlemen on the other side said that  
the duties in the bill were too high. In the  
glass schedule of the Mills bill the per-  
centage ranged from 60 to 152 per cent. If  
that was a tariff, why should not the  
Republicans increase the tariff and make it  
protective in favor of the labor of the  
United States? Why had the gentlemen  
on the other side a duty of 152 per cent  
on plate glass? Was it because it was a  
revenue tariff, or was it because the Demo-  
cratic party of Missouri made that a con-  
dition of its support of the Mills bill? [Ap-  
plause.]

### MR. SPRINGER QUOTED FROM THE TESTIMONY OF THE GLASS MANUFACTURERS OF PITTSBURG.

Mr. Springer quoted from the testimony  
of the glass manufacturers of Pittsburg to  
the effect that if he had free raw material  
he could pay higher wages. Mr. Mills was  
glad to hear his friend (Mr. McKinley) re-  
vise his speech of two years ago, in which  
he characterized the then pending bill as a  
free trade measure. The high duties on the  
glassware schedule of that bill did not meet  
his (Mr. Mills) views. He had been forced  
to accept them. His friend was placed in  
the same predicament in regard to his bill.  
(Mr. McKinley) had at first put a protection  
on hides in his bill, and yet he had been  
compelled to take a free trade position and  
put hides on the free list. Mr. McKinley's  
amendment was adopted.

Mr. Dooliver, of Iowa, made a strong  
speech, in which, in the name of the people  
of his district, he urged the passage of the  
bill. He said that the bill was a protection  
to the people of his district, and that he  
had become weary of this talk of the de-  
pressed condition of the Iowa farmers.

### A FREE TRADE VIEW.

Mr. Clark, of Alabama, suggested that  
the House should take the tariff on the State  
of Alabama on a platform denouncing high  
tariffs. He prophesied that when the bill  
went to the Senate it would be so amended  
that the free list would be called the Illinois  
list. He said that he had been told that  
the bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of  
this talk of the depressed condition of the  
Iowa farmers.

### MR. MILLER'S ADDRESS HIMSELF TO THE BILL, UNCONSIDERING AN AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HENDERSON, OF IOWA.

Mr. Miller, of Ohio, said that the bill  
was a protection to the people of his district,  
and that he had become weary of this talk  
of the depressed condition of the Iowa  
farmers.

### MR. HENDERSON'S SPEECH.

Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, said that the  
bill was a protection to the people of his  
district, and that he had become weary of